Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/642,939	KELLERMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ann T. Hoang	2836	

All Participants:

(1) *Ann T. Hoang*.

(2) *Gregory J. Adams*.

Status of Application: *Allowed*

(3) *John Beinhardt*.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: *3 March 2006*

Time: *1:30 p.m.*

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
N/A

Claims discussed:
1 and 42

Prior art documents discussed:
Logan et al. (US 5,155,652), Anderson et al. (US 5,583,736), Xu et al. (US 5,841,642)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
The changes to the claims discussed place the case in condition for allowance. The attorney approved all changes made through an examiner's amendment. For specific details on changes to the claims, refer to attached sheet and the examiner's amendment.

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

PHUONG T. VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

A search of the prior art revealed Xu et al. (US 5,841,624), which discloses a plurality of electrically conductive protrusions coated with an electrically insulative material, wherein the insulative material on the top surface of the protrusions is etched off so that a conductive surface of the protrusions contacts a substrate placed thereon. The protrusions as disclosed by Xu et al. would be interpreted to be electrically insulative protrusions, since part of the protrusions are coated in an insulative material. However, in light of the amendment made to claim 1 above, the reference fails to meet the claim limitations since Xu et al. does not disclose a protrusion contact area that is entirely electrically insulative.

Anderson et al. (US 5,583,736) discloses a plurality of electrically insulative protrusions and a protrusion contact area that is entirely electrically insulative. However, use of the electrically insulative protrusions of Anderson et al. as the protrusions in the electrostatic chuck of the base reference, Logan et al. (US 5,155,652), would render the apparatus of Logan et al. inoperable, since Logan relies on conductive protrusions of alternating polarity in order to securely clamp a substrate to the chuck. Additionally, Logan et al. discloses that insulated protrusions are undesirable for the apparatus because the materials utilized for the electrical insulators have radically different thermal expansion characteristics than other materials in the apparatus, therefore introducing varying temperature cycles and causing separation between the dissimilar materials.